

REMARKS

1. In the above-captioned Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 9 and 12 for being dependent on a rejected base claim. Claims 8, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Robinson (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,809). These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

2. Claims 8, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Robinson. Prior to discussing the merits of the Examiner's position, the applicant believes it would be helpful to first briefly describe and characterize the Robinson reference.

THE ROBINSON REFERENCE

As stated in Robinson:

Located around the rocker 62 on the side of the pivot 64 thereof which is further from the coil 60 is a hollow flexible walled housing 68 which forms a seal around the rocker 62 without preventing rocking of the rocker 62 about its pivot 64. [Column 3, lines 17-21].

Robinson therefore describes a pressure regulator having a flexible walled housing surrounding a mechanism that includes a rocker. Robinson does *not* describe or suggest *sealably engaging an injection pressure regulator in a test chamber formed by a rigid sleeve*, as stated in independent claim 8 as amended above, nor *placing the injection pressure regulator in a sleeve*, and *sealably engaging at least one O-ring disposed on the injection pressure regulator against at least one interface on an inside surface of the test chamber*, as stated in newly presented independent claims 13 and 15, or any other similar device or method.

Moreover, Robinson does not teach *sealably engaging at least one O-ring disposed on the injection pressure regulator against at least one interface on an inside surface of the test chamber*, as stated in newly presented independent claim 13, nor any similar device as described above.

Therefore, the present invention is not obvious in light of or in any combination based on Robinson. Hence, the applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 8, 13, and 15 may be passed to allowance.

Furthermore, claims 9-11 and 14 are dependent upon an independent claim that is shown to be allowable, thus, the dependent claims are themselves allowable.

3. No new subject matter is introduced by the amendments to the above claims or the addition of the new claims.

4. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication may advance the prosecution of the present application. Notice of allowance of claims 8-15 is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 17, 2006

By: Susan L. Lukasik
Susan L. Lukasik
Registration No. 35,261
Attorney for Applicant
International Engine Intellectual Property
Company, LLC
Voice: (630) 753-2172
Fax: (630) 753-3982